

In re Application of: Allor et al.
Application No.: 09/739,856

Remarks

In the application, claims 10, 11, 13 through 15, 29 through 35 are pending. No claims currently stand allowed.

The Final Office Action dated November 29, 2004, has been carefully considered. The Final Office Action rejects claims 1 through 15 and 27 through 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by, or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as rendered obvious by, U.S. Patents 6,144,962 ("Weinberg") and 5,953,725 ("Lowry").

In this Amendment D, the elements of former dependent claim 12 are incorporated into claim 12's antecedent independent claim 10. New claim 30 incorporates the elements of claims 13 and its antecedent claim 10. Thus, the pending independent claims 10 and 30 correspond to former dependent claims 12 and 13, respectively.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Final Office Action's rejection of claims 12 and 13 (now represented by independent claims 10 and 30, respectively). The following elements of claim 10, as currently amended, do not exist in the cited art:

Claim 10: displaying at least one representation of a computer that is to be used to work on the project, *wherein the computer has a work queue; and*

in response to a user of the plurality moving the task representation to the computer representation, adding the represented task to the work queue of the represented computer.

(Emphasis added.) Against these elements, the Final Office Action cites Weinberg's Link Doctor of Figure 22 and the text of column 31, lines 14 through 24. However, that text is a selection from a section that begins on column 30, line 66, and is entitled "Link Repair Plug-In." That section focuses on using the graphical display of Weinberg to repair broken URL links. In that section, there is no discussion of the links having anything to do with a work queue for a computer, and similarly no discussion that repairing a link has anything to do with adding a task to a computer's work queue. Indeed, the section, if anything, teaches away from these elements of claim 10, as amended, because here Weinberg is only concerned with correcting errors, not with the regular job of assigning tasks. Therefore, claim 10, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by, the cited art.

In re Application of: Allor et al.
Application No.: 09/739,856

The Final Office Action's rejection of claim 13 refers back to its rejection of claim 12. For reasons similar to those above, the following elements of former claim 13, now incorporated into new claim 30, are neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by, the cited art of Weinberg:

Claim 30: displaying at least one representation of a user of the plurality of users, *wherein the represented user has a work queue; and*


in response to a transfer of the task representation to the user representation, adding the represented task to the work queue of the represented user.

Thus, the invention as presently claimed in independent claims 10 and 30 contains elements not found in the cited art. The remaining pending claims are dependent upon independent claims 10 or 30 and are thus allowable for at least the reasons given above. Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn and that all currently pending claims be allowed.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John T. Bretscher, Reg. No. 52,651
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312)616-5600 (telephone)
(312)616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: February 1, 2005